

services in Li to address the arguments about the “separate residential units or business units.” This fails to address the “separate residential units or business units.” A single private LAN (as in Li) having even hundreds of phone lines and active servers does not disclose the required “separate residential units or business units.” If this rejection is continued, the Examiner should point out where there is a separate residential or business unit that is treated as a client for combining resources. A single LAN sharing multiple telephone lines is not a plurality of separate residential or business units. The clients in Li are individual computers 12. An individual computer is not a “separate residential units or business unit.” There is no client in Li other than an individual computer 12 in an individual LAN and the Examiner has not pointed to any other form of client. The present claims define the client in a manner that does not permit application of the individual computer 12 in Li’s individual LAN to the claims and this issue has not been addressed in the advisory action.

Regarding claims 29, 31 and 33, the Examiner again points to the networks 102, 103, and 104. The advisory action fails to show that these networks are networked together to share a resource connection, which would be required to meet the claims. The portions of Vange pointed to by the Examiner show nothing more than multiple LANs each having their own ISP connection and there is no indicate of that ISP connection being shared with other LANs.

As acknowledged in the advisory action, the resource connection in Vange is through the routers 109. Vange does not disclose that the networks 102 and 103 are networked together to share their connections through the respective routers 109, though. The Examiner should explain how the network 102, for example, makes use of the router belonging to the network 103 and *vice versa* if this rejection is to be maintained. There is believed to be no such disclosure or suggestion.

For all of the above reasons, applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of the application. The separate patentability of dependent claims not discussed is maintained. Should the examiner believe that outstanding issues exist and that a telephone conference would aid prosecution, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

/STEVEN P. FALLON/

By

Steven P. Fallon

Registration No. 35,132

April 21, 2010

300 South Wacker Drive, Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 360-0080  
Customer No. 24978